DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 742 SP 005 956

AUTHOR Rubenstein, Alice E.; Sage, Ellis H.
TITLE Teacher Competence: Encounter vs. Behavioral Modeling.
PUB DATE Mar 72
NOTE 3p.; Research paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Chicago, March, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Science Research; *Behavior Change; *Educational Research; Elementary School Teachers; Instructional Films; *Models; Protocol Materials; Self Evaluation; *Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Encounter Groups

ABSTRACT

This study explored two group treatments, humanistic and social modeling, in helping teachers to be more open and helpful in the classroom. Subjects were 42 volunteers from elementary schools who indicated a desire to become more open and helpful. Each of four groups met four times over a 9 day period for 1 1/2 hours. The modeling groups viewed a video tape with detailed instructions of a teacher exhibiting open and helpful behavior. In the humanistic group, members had control over the content and direction of the group. Parts of the Sequential Analysis of Verbal Interaction (SAVI) were used by raters who took a frequency count of statements from 2 hours of classroom session. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was administered at the conclusion of the groups. The results supported both hypotheses: (1) Behavioral modeling can be used to alter open and helpful behaviors of teachers; (2) Self-report measures do not necessarily reflect behavioral change. (Author)

ED 070742

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY


## ABSTRACT

Teacher Competence: Encounter vs. Behavioral Modeling Group techniques with teachers have been tried by some (Patton, 1968). There is no report of attempts to alter teacher behavior via the use of social modeling (Bandura 1969). The purpose of this study was to explore two group treatments, humanistic and social modeling, in helping teachers to be more open and helpful in the classroom. Subjects were volunteers (N=42) who indicated a desire to become more open and helpful. Each of four groups met 4 times for 1½ hours. The modeling groups viewed a video tape along with detailed instructions of a teacher exhibiting open and helpful behaviors. The group leader pointed out to the group when they were exhibiting the desired behaviors. In the humanistic group members had control over the content and direction of the group and the leader used such techniques as reflection and interpretation. Parts of the Sequential Analysis of Verbal Interaction were used by raters who took a frequency count of such statements from 2 hours of classroom sessions. The POI was administered at the conclusion of the groups. No overall treatment effects were evident but a significant school effect was present on the SAVI. There were no school effects on the POI and one scale reflected an overall treatment effect. Mean comparisons on the SAVI indicated a significant effect of the modeling treatment in one school but no effects in either of the humanistic group schools. The humanistic groups showed significant effects on 2 POI scales. Only one POI scale was significant for the behavioral modeling. The results support the hypothesis that behavioral modeling can be used to alter teacher open and helping behaviors and indicate that self report measures do not necessarily reflect behavioral change.


SP 005 956

Presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention. Chicago, March 1972.

# Teacher Competence: Encounter vs. Behavioral Modeling

Alice Rubenstein[1]
University of Rochester

Ellis H. Sage[2]
University of Rochester

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP 005 956

The growing concern for preventive, rather than remedial mental health programs in schools has been increasingly evident in the past decade. The use of group techniques with teachers, to alter their behavior in the classroom, have been tried by some (Berman, 1954; Patton, 1968). There is, however, no report of attempts to alter teacher behavior via the use of social modeling as described by Bandura (1969), (i.e., that incentive, modeling and detailed coding are basic to learning complex social skills). The purpose of this study was to explore the pragmatic use of two group treatments; humanistic and social modeling, in helping teachers to become more open and helpful in the classroom. It was hypothesized that: 1) Ss exposed to the social modeling treatment would produce more open and helpful verbal behaviors in the classroom. 2) that there would be no differences reflective of behavioral change in the self report measures of teachers regardless of group treatment.

## METHODOLOGY

Subjects: The Ss were volunteers (N = 42) from four elementary schools who indicated a desire to become more open and helpful in the classroom. Seven volunteers from each school, as group, were randomly assigned to one of two treatment conditions, the remaining Ss served as control Ss.

Instruments: Part of the Sequential Analysis of Verbal Interaction (SAVI, Simon and Agazarian, 1967), which relate to open and helping behaviors, were used by trained raters who took a frequency count of such statements from two hour taped classroom sessions of all Ss. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI, Shostrom, 1966) was administered to all Ss following the conclusion of the groups. The recordings and POI measures were gathered the week following the conclusion of the treatment.

Experimental Manipulations: Each of four groups met four times for approximately 1½ hours over a nine day period. The modeling groups viewed a video tape of a teacher exhibiting open and helpful behaviors in her classroom. The film was accompanied by detailed instructions about the behaviors being viewed and the group leader pointed out to the group when they were exhibiting the desired behaviors and when they were not. In the humanistic group the group members had control over the content and direction of the group, although the leader attempted to use the content in terms of Ss stated desire to become more open and helpful. The leader used such techniques as reflection, clarification and interpretation.

---

[1] Presently Psychologist, Rush-Henrietta Central Schools, Mental Health Department.

[2] Presently Director of the Counseling Center, University of Redlands.

Statistical Comparisons: A post-test only control group design was utilized and the results were analyzed by means of an analysis of variance for nested factors (Weiner p. 184).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings showed no significant overall treatment effects on teacher open and helping behaviors, indicating that those who received a group experience (regardless of treatment) did not differ from those who received no treatment. A significant school effect, however, was evident, indicating that the schools themselves differed from each other. The POI yielded no significant school effects and only 1 (out of 12) scales on the POI, Nature of Man, yielded a significant overall treatment effect. The multiple comparisons (t-tests) made on the SAVI, comparing treatment groups to each other and their own controls, either singularly or as a group, yielded a significant effect of the modeling treatment in one school, but no effects in either of humanistic group schools. Although no humanistic treatment effects were evident on the behavioral rating forms when comparing humanistic groups to controls, significant effects were found in two POI scales; Nature of Man and Synergy. The behavioral modeling groups, which did show some significant treatment effects, had only one POI scale which was significantly different when compared to control groups; this was the feeling reactivity scale.

The results lend support to the hypothesis that:

1. Behavioral modeling can be used to alter teacher open and helping verbal behaviors in the classroom.

2. Self report measures do not necessarily reflect behavioral change.

## REFERENCES

Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1969.

Berman, L. The mental health of the educator. Mental Hygiene, 1954, 38, 442-449.

Patton, B. Group conseling with teachers and teacher-student perceptions of behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 1454-A.

Shostrom, E. Personal Orientation Inventory, San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1966.

Simon, A. and Agazarian, Y. Sequential analysis of verbal interaction. Philadelphia, Pa.,: Research for Better Schools. 1967.

Winer, B. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1962.